

REMARKS

The Specification and Claims 12 and 15 are objected to on formal grounds. These objections have been addressed.

The Examiner stated that the drawings were never submitted. The USPTO Public Pair and Applicant's records show that Drawing Figure 1 was submitted. Nevertheless, we resubmit Figure 1 of the drawings.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

Claims 1-8, 10-11, 13-14 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Ricketts et al US 5967860*.

Claims 9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of *Ricketts et al.*

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of *Ricketts et al* as applied to claims 1-14 and 16-19 above, and further in view of *Koichi JP 59-153852*.

Ricketts discloses a coating containing Ag-Ni-C, but has no disclosure of Mo or W. The examiner has cited *Koichi* with respect to coatings containing Mo or W. Applicant finds no information in this reference about how the material was made and in which form it can be obtained. It should be noted that the corresponding Japanese publication mentions Ag-CdO and Ag-SnO₂ in the left column of page 1. This clearly indicates that the publication refers to bulk material, as mixtures of silver and oxides cannot be made by electro plating. Furthermore, electro plating of tungsten and molybdenum is also not feasible. As salts of molybdenum or tungsten do not dissolve in water, there is no feasible way to create molybdenum or tungsten ions in a solution.

The coating disclosed by *Ricketts* is made by electro-deposition. The examiner states that the possibility of vapor deposition was also disclosed. However, column 2, lines 58 to 59 quoted by the examiner refer to vapor deposition of a nickel under layer, and not the Ag-Ni-C coating.

As *Ricketts* teaches electro-deposition of Ag-Ni-C coatings, nothing in either reference could teach or suggest a combination with a bulk material unsuitable for electro-deposition such as is disclosed by *Koichi*.

CONCLUSION

Applicant asserts that all of the Examiner's objections have been obviated, and therefore now respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections and allowance of the application.

PETITION FOR AN EXTENSION OF THE TERM

Applicant hereby petitions for a one-month extension of the term for reply from 4 November 2009 to 4 December 2009. An amount of \$130 to cover the cost of the extension is authorized to be charged to the credit card ending in 4039. Any deficiency or overpayment should be charged or credited to Deposit Account Number 04-2219, referencing our Docket Number 14261.

Respectfully submitted,

/Keith H. Orum/

Keith H. Orum
Attorney Registration No 33985
Attorney for Applicant

Orum & Roth LLC
53 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3606
Telephone: 312.922.6262